UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,124	07/10/2001	William D. Meadow	2222.4960001	7209
	7590 02/05/200 SLER, GOLDSTEIN &	EXAMINER		
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			NGUYEN, NGA B	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3692	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/901,124	MEADOW ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid aband application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, wh application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following periods:	ich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, which no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILE MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office	ED WITHIN TWO extension fee e extension fee
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months	en if timely filed,
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS	appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered becataly and the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered becataly and the proposed amendment of the proposed after the proposed amendment of the proposed after the proposed after the proposed after the proposed amendment of the prop	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (P	TOL 224)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment	
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an exphow the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 1,2 and 6-8. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 3-5 and 9-14. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is n was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ecessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance See Continuation Sheet.	e because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:	
/Nga B. Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding to claims 3-5 and 9-14, applicant's arguments regarding to "intended use" are fully considered but are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In this case, the claimed invention recites an intended use, although Hayosh fails to discuss the intended use which is to receive and print the hash value containing in the MICR line of a check, Hayosh's computer system is capable of printing and verifying the hash value containing in the MICR line of a check. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hayosh's to include the feature above for the purpose of enhancing the security in processing a check. Therefore, examiner decides to maintain the rejections regarding to claims 3-5 and 9-14.

/Nga B. Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692